

## **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed July 5, 2007. A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Prior to the Office Action mailed July 5, 2007, Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, the specification was objected to. Claims 24, 63, and 68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 26, 63, and 70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Underwood (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,128).

### **II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments**

The present Response amends Claims 26, 63, and 70, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

### **III. Objections to the Specification**

In the Office Action mailed July 5, 2007, the specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The Office Action required correction of first business logic component and second business logic component. It is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the arts would recognize that enterprise java beans are business logic components. Thus, for example, paragraph [0009] of the specification would clearly provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

In the Office Action mailed July 5, 2007, Claims 24, 63, and 68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 26, 63, and 70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 24, 63, and 68 conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for the same reasons as stated above in response to the objection to the

specification. Claims 26, 63, and 70 have also been amended and it is respectfully submitted that Claims 26, 63, and 70, as amended, conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

In the Office Action mailed July 5, 2007, Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Underwood (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,128).

**Claim 24**

First, it is respectfully submitted that Underwood does not appear to disclose generating a unified user profile by creating a second business logic component to extend the first business logic component. Extend is a term of art in the field of computer programming, in that a class extends another class in order to add functionality either by adding fields or methods, or by overriding methods. As disclosed in Underwood, the AFUserDB component does not appear to extend or relate to the AFUserSS component in any way.

Second, it is also respectfully submitted that Underwood does not appear to disclose wherein the extended first business logic component uses a property set, said property set adapted to give namespace qualifications to implicit and explicit properties of said data in said personalization database; and further wherein said implicit and explicit properties comprise getter and setter properties. While Underwood discloses various interfaces defining access to the AFUserSS component (col. 52, lines 40-55), Underwood does not appear to disclose anything related to using a property set adapted to give namespace qualifications.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment defined by Claim 24 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**Claims 63 and 68**

For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 24, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 63 and 68, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **Claims 25-29, 64, and 69-73**

Claims 25-29, 64, and 69-73 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 25-29, 64, and 69-73 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also respectfully submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

### **VI. Summary of Examiner Interview**

On October 18, 2007, applicants' representatives, Guanyao Cheng and Joe O'Malley, conducted an interview via telephone with Examiner Pham. Claim 24 was discussed in relation to Underwood (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,128). Applicants argued that Underwood does not disclose claim limitations (a)-(e) of Claim 24. No agreements were reached. Applicants thank Examiner Pham for taking the time to discuss the pending Application with the applicants' representatives.

### **VII. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 5, 2007

By: /Guanyao Cheng/  
Guanyao Cheng  
Reg. No. 58,555

Customer No. 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800